UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,992	12/27/2000	Scott W. Weller	D/A0A49	6350

7590   03/11/2004

John E. Beck
Xerox Corporation
Xerox Square 20A
Rochester, NY 14644

EXAMINER
JACK, TODD M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2133	

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>6</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 December 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/27/00*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase, "the

authenticity verifier contains first and second sets of authenticity information" has been

repeated in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davis

(5,633,932).

Claim 1: Davis teaches the verification sensitivity of a document and if normal,

authenticates the nearness of the printing mode (col. 6, lines 33-48), upon receiving

authentication through providing a PIN, release code, an authentication token and the

like, printing node decrypts the document and thereafter prints the document (col. 6,

lines 40-45), and if the document is "sensitive", the printing node stores the encrypted

document in an internal buffer memory (col. 6, lines 38-41).

Claim 2: Further, Davis teaches upon transmitting the document to a printing node, the sending node creates a header including disclosure protection information such as "print only" tags (col. 6, lines 9-20).

Claim 3: Further, Davis teaches the header placed on the document includes a public key and tokens (col. 6, lines 21-32).

Claim 5: Further, Davis teaches if the document is a normal document, the printing node decrypts the document (col. 6, lines 33-48).

Claim 6: Further, Davis teaches if the document is a normal document, the printing node decrypts the document (col. 6, lines 35-37), applying an asymmetric algorithm to form an encrypted document (col. 4, lines 39-56), and comparing the captured frames to identify and authenticate the user, then identified the "sensitive" document or normal document for printing (col. 6, lines 1-19).

Claim 9: Davis teaches the printing mode may contain memory-storing PINs (col. 5, lines 33-42), receiving a print job (col. 6, lines 33-35), if the document is a normal document, the printing node decrypts the document (col. 6, lines 33-48), and if the document is a normal document, the printing node decrypts the document (col. 6, lines 35-37).

Claim 10: Further, Davis teaches the printing mode may contain memory storing

PINs (col. 5, lines 33-42), applying a PIN of the intended recipient on the printing node

before starting a print job of a sensitive document (col. 5, lines 37-39), and a release

code generated at print-time and included in the header if verified as the user (col. 5,

lines 43-51).

Claim 11: Further, Davis teaches if the authentication is a release code enables

the intended recipient to instruct the printing node to begin printing the sensitive

document (col. 6, lines 25-32) and upon receiving authentication through providing a

PIN, release code, an authentication token and the like, printing node decrypts the

document and thereafter prints the document (col. 6, lines 40-45).

Claim 12: Davis teaches upon receiving authentication through providing a PIN,

release code, an authentication token and the like, the printing mode decrypts the

document and thereafter prints the document (col. 6, lines 41-48).

Claim 13: Further, Davis teaches upon receiving authentication through

providing a PIN, release code, an authentication token and the like, the printing mode

decrypts the document and thereafter prints the document (col. 6, lines 41-48) and if a

sensitive document, the printing node stores the encrypted document in an internal

buffer memory (col. 6, lines 38-41).

Claim 14: Further, Davis teaches the document is identified as a sensitive

document or a normal document, if normal- a header is created including disclosure

information (col. 6, lines 9-20).

Claim 15: Further, Davis teaches upon receiving authentication through

providing a PIN, release code, an authentication token and the like, printing node

decrypts the document and thereafter prints the document (col. 6, lines 40-45), if each

of the captured frames of biometrics compare correctly to the stored master, the user is

identified and authenticated (col. 6, lines 1-8), and biometrics to capture a single frame

of data or multiple data frames with previously stored master (col. 6, lines 1-8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Davis (5,633,932).

Claim 4: Further, Davis teaches the verification sensitivity of a document and if

normal, authenticates the nearness of the printing mode (col. 6, lines 33-48) and the

more than one sending nodes coupled to the printing node through shared or

independent communication similar to lines where a printing node decrypts the

document before outputting (col. 3, lines 36-39). Davis does not explicitly teach the

verification sensitivity of a document. It is commonly known in the art that each sending

node has a unique signature encrypted to it. It would have been obvious to combine

Davis' teachings to that which is commonly known in the art because it would be easy to

authenticate the node by matching its transmitted signature with that in storage, thus

increasing the security of the printing.

Claim 7: Further, Davis teaches the sending and printing nodes use two

separate keys for encryption and decryption where the pubic key of the printing node

should be initially accessible to the sending node through one of several verification

methods (col. 3, lines 40-51), and each method may use a digital certificate to obtain

PUK and substantiate authenticity of the printer node (col. 3, lines 43-53). Davis

teaches comparing the captured frames to identify and authenticate the user, then

identified the "sensitive" document or normal document for printing (col. 6, lines 1-19).

Davis does not explicitly teach applying a cipher or an algorithm to an electronic

document to create a received message digest. It is commonly known in the art that it

would have been obvious to apply to the document a certificate to produce a public key

is analogous to the use of either a cipher or an algorithm. It would have been obvious

to combine Davis' teachings to that which would have been commonly known in the art

to allow alternate methods to be used for encryption/decryption for efficiency and

convenience.

Claim 8: Further, Davis teaches if each of the captured frames of biometrics compare correctly to the stored master, the user is identified and authenticated (col. 6, lines 1-8), and biometrics to capture a single frame of data or multiple data frames with previously stored master (col. 6, lines 1-8). Davis does not explicitly teach the use of matching for verification. It is commonly known in the art that matching a transmitted identifier with that of record would assist in authenticating the party. It would have been obvious to combine Davis' teachings to that which would have been commonly known in the art to increase speed of the operating system and therefore the authentication process.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Todd M Jack whose telephone number is 703-305-1027. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady, can be reached at 703-305-9595.

Todd Jack
Art Unit 2133

February 26, 2004

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100